

Federal Aviation Administration – [Regulations and Policies](#)  
Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee

Transport Airplane and Engine Issue Area  
Airworthiness Assurance Working Group

**Task 4 – Supplemental Structural Inspection Program**

## **Task Assignment**

Committee of the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee.  
**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**  
 William J. (Joe) Sullivan, Executive Director, General Aviation and Business Airplane Subcommittee, Aircraft Certification Service (AIR-3), 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, telephone: (202) 267-9562, FAX: (202) 267-9562.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:** The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) established an Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (58 FR 2190, May 22, 1991) which held its first meeting on May 23, 1991 (58 FR 20492, May 19, 1991). The General Aviation and Business Airplane Subcommittee was established at that meeting to provide advice and recommendations to the Administrator, Aircraft Certification Service, regarding the airworthiness standards for standard and commuter category airplanes and engines in part 23 of the Federal Aviation Regulations, and parallel provisions of parts 91 and 135 of the Federal Aviation Regulations. The FAA announced at the Joint Aviation Authorities (JAA)-Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Harmonization Conference in Toronto, Ontario, Canada, (June 2-5, 1992) that it would consolidate within the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee the ongoing objective to "harmonize" the Joint Aviation Requirements (JAR) and the Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR). Coincident with that announcement, the FAA assigned to the General Aviation and Business Airplane Subcommittee those rulemaking projects related to JAR/FAR Harmonization which were then in the process of being coordinated between the JAA and the FAA. The Harmonization process included the intention to present the results of JAA/FAA coordination to the public in the form of a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking—an objective comparable to and compatible with that assigned to the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee. The General Aviation and Business Airplane Subcommittee, subsequently, established the JAR/FAR Harmonization Working Group. Specifically, the Working Group's tasks are the following: The JAR/FAR 23 Harmonization Working Group is charged with making recommendations to the General Aviation and Business Airplane Subcommittee concerning the FAA disposition of the following rulemaking subjects recently coordinated between the JAA and the FAA:

**Task 1 Review JAR Issues:** Review FAR 23 Issue No. 4 (which excludes

commuter category airplanes) and No. 5 (which includes commuter category airplanes), and compare them with Amendment 23-42 to FAR 23, and the proposals in Notices 3 and 4 from the Part 23 Airworthiness Review. Identify technical differences between JAR 23 and FAR 23 which can be harmonized.

**Task 2-Systems and Equipment:** Based on the results of the Task 1 review, identify the changes to Subparts D and F of FAR 23 that are appropriate for harmonization, and those provisions that should not be harmonized, if any.

**Task 3-Powerplant:** Based on the results of the Task 1 review, identify the changes to Subpart E of FAR 23 that are appropriate for harmonization, and those provisions that should not be harmonized, if any.

**Task 4-Flight Test:** Based on the results of the Task 1 review, identify the changes to Subparts A, B and G of FAR 23 that are appropriate for harmonization, and those provisions that should not be harmonized, if any.

**Task 5-Airframe:** Based on the results of the Task 1 review, identify the changes to Subparts C and D of FAR 23 that are appropriate for harmonization, and those provisions that should not be harmonized, if any.

#### Reports

A. Recommend time line(s) for completion of each task, including rationale, for Subcommittee consideration at the meeting of the subcommittee held following publication of this notice.

B. Give a detailed presentation to the subcommittee of the results of Task 1 before proceeding with Tasks 2-5.

C. Give a detailed conceptual presentation on Tasks 2-5 to the Subcommittee before proceeding with the work stated under item D, below. Each presentation should identify what proposed amendments will be included in each notice, and whether any additional notices will be need to be drafted in addition to the four identified in item D, below. These reports may be combined or presented separately at the discretion of the working group chair.

D. Draft a separate Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for Tasks 2-5 proposing new or revised requirements, a supporting economic analysis, and other required analysis, with any other collateral documents (such as Advisory Circulars) the Working Group determines to be needed.

E. Give a status report on each task at each meeting of the Subcommittee.

The JAR/FAR 23 Harmonization Working Group will be comprised of experts from those organizations having an interest in the task assigned to it. A

working group member need not necessarily be a representative of one of the organizations of the parent General Aviation and Business Airplane Subcommittee or of the full Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee. An individual who has expertise in the subject matter and wishes to become a member of the working group should write the person listed under the caption "FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT" expressing that desire, describing his or her interest in the task, and the expertise he or she would bring to the working group. The request will be reviewed with the subcommittee chair and working group leader, and the individual advised whether or not the request can be accommodated.

The Secretary of Transportation has determined that the information and use of the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee and its subcommittees are necessary in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed on the FAA by law. Meetings of the full committee and any subcommittees will be open to the public except as authorized by section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Meetings of the JAR/FAR 23 Harmonization Working Group will not be open to the public, except to the extent that individuals with an interest and expertise are selected to participate. No public announcement of working group meetings will be made.

Issued in Washington, DC, on November 19, 1992.

William J. Sullivan,

Executive Director, General Aviation and Business Airplane Subcommittee, Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee.

[FR Doc. 92-28931 Filed 11-27-92; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

#### Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee; Transport Airplane and Engine Subcommittee; Airworthiness Assurance Working Group

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of establishment of the airworthiness assurance working group.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is given of the establishment of an Airworthiness Assurance Working Group by the Transport Airplane and Engine Subcommittee.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. William J. (Joe) Sullivan, Executive Director, Transport Airplane and Engine Subcommittee, Aircraft Certification Service (AIR-3), 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591,

Telephone: (202) 267-9554; FAX: (202) 267-5364.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) established an Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC) (56 FR 2190, January 22, 1991) which held its first meeting on May 23, 1991 (56 FR 20492, May 3, 1991). The Transport Airplane and Engine Subcommittee was established at that meeting to provide advice and recommendations to the Director, Aircraft Certification Service, FAA, regarding the airworthiness standards for transport category airplanes and engines in parts 25, 33 and 35 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR parts 25, 33, 35).

Before the establishment of the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee, the agency's Research, Engineering, and Development Advisory Committee established a Transport Airplane Safety Subcommittee. In turn that subcommittee established the Airworthiness Assurance Task Force to deal with issues arising out of the tragic aircraft accident in Hawaii involving an Aloha Airlines B-737. The ARAC Transport Airplane and Engine Subcommittee was tasked with assuming jurisdiction over the Airworthiness Assurance Task Force. This was accomplished, and this notice renames the Task Force as the Airworthiness Assurance Working Group and restates its tasks.

Specifically, the Airworthiness Assurance Working Group's tasks are:

**Task 1-Corrosion:** Develop recommendations concerning whether new or revised requirements and compliance methods for corrosion prevention and control programs should be instituted and made mandatory for the Airbus A-300, British Aerospace BAC 1-11, Boeing B-707, B-727, B-737, B-747, Douglas DC-8, DC-9/MD-80, DC-10, Fokker F-28, and Lockheed L-1011.

**Task 2-Repairs:** Develop recommendations concerning whether new or revised requirements and compliance methods for structural repair assessments of existing repairs should be instituted and made mandatory for the Airbus A-300, British Aerospace BAC 1-11, Boeing B-707, B-727, B-737, B-747, Douglas DC-8, DC-9/MD-80, DC-10, Fokker F-28, and Lockheed L-1011.

**Task 3-Structural Fatigue Audit:** Develop recommendations on whether new or revised requirements for structural fatigue evaluation and corrective action should be instituted and made mandatory as the airplane ages past its original design life goal.

**Task 4-Supplemental Structural Inspection Programs:** Conduct a review of existing supplemental structural inspection programs to determine whether any new or revised requirements should be instituted and made mandatory as the airplane ages past its original design life goal. This review should cover the following airplanes: Airbus A-300, British Aerospace BAC 1-11, Boeing B-707, B-727, B-737, B-747, Douglas DC-8, DC-9/MD-80, DC-10, Fokker F-28, and Lockheed L-1011.

#### Reports

A. Recommend time line(s) for completion of each task, including rationale, for Subcommittee consideration at the meeting of the subcommittee held after the publication of this notice.

B. Give a detailed conceptual presentation to the Subcommittee, and receive its concurrence, before proceeding with the work stated under item D, below.

C. Draft a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking proposing requested or modified new or revised requirements, a supporting economic, and other required analysis, with any other collateral documents the Working Group determines to be needed.

D. Give a status report on each task at each meeting of the Subcommittee.

The Airworthiness Assurance Working Group will be comprised of experts from those organizations having an interest in the task assigned to it. A working group member need not necessarily be a representative of one of the organizations of the parent Transport Airplane and Engine Subcommittee or of the full Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee. An individual who has expertise in the subject matter and wishes to become a member of the working group should write the person listed under the caption **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** expressing that desire, describing his or her interest in the task, and the expertise he or she would bring to the working group. The request will be reviewed with the subcommittee chair and working group leader, and the individual advised whether or not the request can be accommodated.

The Secretary of Transportation has determined that the information and use of the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee and its subcommittees are necessary in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed on the FAA by law. Meetings of the full committee and any subcommittees will be open to the public except as authorized by section

10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Meetings of the Airworthiness Assurance Working Group will not be open to the public, except to the extent that individuals with an interest and expertise are selected to participate. No public announcement of working group meetings will be made.

Issued in Washington, DC, on November 19, 1992.

William J. Sullivan,

Executive Director, Transport Airplane and Engine Subcommittee, Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee.

[FR Doc. 92-28936 Filed 11-27-92; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

#### Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee; Transport Airplane and Engine Subcommittee; Small Transport and Commuter Airworthiness Assurance Working Group

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of establishment of the small transport and commuter airworthiness assurance working group.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is given of the establishment of a Small Transport and Commuter Airworthiness Assurance Working Group by the Transport Airplane and Engine Subcommittee.

**DATES:** William J. (Joe) Sullivan, Executive Director, Transport Airplane and Engine Subcommittee, Aircraft Certification Service (AIR-3), 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, Telephone: (202) 267-9554; FAX: (202) 267-5364.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) established an Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC) (56 FR 2190, January 22, 1991) which held its first meeting on May 23, 1991 (56 FR 20492, May 3, 1991). The Transport Airplane and Engine Subcommittee was established at that meeting to provide advice and recommendations to the Director, Aircraft Certification Service, FAA, regarding the airworthiness standard for transport category airplanes, engines, and propellers in parts 25, 33 and 35 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR parts 25, 33, 35).

Before the establishment of the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee, the agency's Research, Engineering, and Development Advisory Committee established a Transport Airplane Safety Subcommittee. In turn that subcommittee established the Airworthiness Assurance Task Force

## **Recommendation**

Gerald R. Mack  
Director  
Certification &  
Government Requirements

Boeing Commercial Airplane Group  
P.O. Box 3707, MS 67-UM  
Seattle, WA 98124-2207

January 20, 1995  
B-T01B-ARAC-95-002

Action: ARM

Mr. Anthony J. Broderick  
Associate Administrator for Regulations and Certification, (AVR-1)  
Department of Transportation  
Federal Aviation Administration  
800 Independence Avenue, S.W.  
Washington DC 20591

**BOEING**

Dear Mr. Broderick:

**Subject: Recommendations of ARAC/Airworthiness Assurance  
Working Group (AAWG) on Aircraft Corrosion Prevention  
and Control Programs (CPCP)**

The AAWG is currently tasked to develop recommendations on whether new or revised requirements and compliance methods for corrosion prevention and control programs should be instituted and made mandatory for certain Airbus, British Aerospace, Boeing, McDonnell Douglas, Fokker and Lockheed aircraft. Since CPCP Airworthiness Directives have either been proposed or adopted for all of the affected aircraft, ARAC on Transport Aircraft and Engine Issues (ARAC) is recommending that this task be considered as complete.

We (ARAC) have been advised that the Flight Standards Service is developing a proposed FAR Part 121/125/129/135 rule which if adopted, would require that operators incorporate an FAA approved CPCP into their maintenance program within a specified time after the rule becomes effective. AAWG recommends endorsement of this rulemaking since it would provide Flight Standards with explicit regulatory authority to mandate comprehensive CPCPs among each of the operators. In the past AAWG had recommended that such programs be mandated by Airworthiness Directives in part, because it would have taken too long to adopt other rulemaking options. However, for in-production aircraft and particularly for newly produced and future aircraft the AAWG believes that AD's should not be used to mandate CPCP's. In order to ensure that comprehensive CPCPs continue to be developed for each of the various aircraft types, AAWG recognizes that the above proposed FAR Part 121/125/129/135/ rule would require companion Advisory Circulars and offers its expertise to assist in their development.

**BOEING**

AAWG is also recommending that current in production airplanes be removed from the existing CPCP AD's once a manufacturer has an initial CPCP in place for use by operators. This may be implemented by means of a separate document or integration into a MRB or MPD document. This recommendation is based upon the anticipated adoption of the above FAR Part 121 rule and upon the initial recommendations of AATF (AAWG) that it was never their intention to recommend that CPCP AD's continue to be made applicable for each of the then future produced (now currently produced) aircraft types.

ARAC TAEIG was also advised that the FAA was soliciting industry input on whether the existing Boeing CPCP AD's should be revised to conform to the format used for the McDonnell Douglas CPCP AD's. While it was acknowledged that the McDonnell Douglas AD's delegate more oversight authority to the PMI, the AAWG believes that the McDonnell Douglas AD's still fall short of totally integrating the CPCP into an operator's existing maintenance program. AAWG recommends that the McDonnell Douglas AD's be further revised to allow operators the opportunity of adjusting subsequent compliance intervals without prior FAA approval, provided the adjustment is substantiated in accordance with FAA approved operator reliability program practices. For operations which have obtained alternative means of compliance approvals, the Boeing CPCP's are now equivalent to McDonnell Douglas CPCP's. For such operators the proposed action to convert the Boeing AD's into the McDonnell Douglas CPCP format without meaningful change, only adds expense by requiring them to change paperwork with no added benefit.

In summary, ARAC TAEIG supports the following AAWG recommendations:

1. that the existing AAWG task on CPCP be removed from the active ARAC project list; and
2. that the project to propose FAR 121/125/129/135 rulemaking requiring operators to have a CPCP program for their fleet, be accelerated; and
3. that newly manufactured airplanes be removed from existing CPCP AD's once manufacturing documentation for implementation of a comprehensive CPCP for such aircraft, has been issued; and



4. that the McDonnell Douglas CPCP AD's be revised so that once the initial tasks are incorporated into an operators maintenance program, the operators are able to conduct their CPCP in accordance with current Flight Standards approval practices. Once implemented, the Boeing CPCP AD's should also be revised to confirm to the format of the revised McDonnell Douglas AD.

**BOEING**

The FAA response to these recommendations is appreciated.

Sincerely,

*G. R. Mack*

G. R. Mack  
Assistant Chairman, ARAC  
Transport Airplane & Engine Issues Group  
Tele: (206) 234-9570, Fax: 237-0192

cc: ARAC TAEIG Group Members  
AAWG Chairman



FAA Action: Withdrawn